

|   |                 |              |  |
|---|-----------------|--------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | Application No. | Applicant(s) |  |
|   | 10/801,944      | STROM ET AL. |  |
|   | Examiner        | Art Unit     |  |
|   | Paresh Patel    | 2829         |  |

**All Participants:**

 (1) Paresh Patel.

 (2) Anthony G. Smyth.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 16 February 2007
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**
☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 02/12/2006, the Examiner called Mr. Smyth to overcome 35 USC 101 issue (which brought up during conference for Appeal Brief that was filed on 10/30/2006) and for possible allowance with amendment to independent claims (to overcome the Harris reference). Examiner suggested a language i.e. calculating probe float by subtracting results of said acquiring from said obtaining for claim 1 and similar language for other independent claims. Mr. Smyth consulted the client, later on 02/16/2006 the Examiner was informed that the reference Harris does not disclose method steps of claim 1. Regarding 35 USC 101 issue, Mr. Smyth requested an office action. .